DIVISION TWO	TON
STATE OF WASHINGTON,	
Respondent,	
v.	
AARON TROTTER,	
Appellant.	
ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR COWLITZ COUNTY	
The Honorable Michael Evans, Judge	
TATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS FOR REVIEW	V
	Aarc
	F

Jared Steed

From:

gramma <mamabear555@comcast.net>

Sent:

Friday, February 24, 2017 4:00 PM

To:

Jared Steed

Subject:

re your client Aaron Wallace Trotter

February 18, 2017

Your Honor,

As a faithful believer in the Constitution and the justice system in this country, I implore you to consider some facts about my trial that I found to test the very foundation of that justice system and my Constitutional rights.

I was tried three times, over the course of a year, for the same crime. I was confident that the legal system would protect me and I never shied away from telling my story, which never changed. The trial transcripts show that this was not the case for the prosecution. A witness was caught with inconsistent testimony during the first trial, which lead to an acquittal on one charge, and a hung jury on the other.

Unfortunately, the State was given a second chance to prosecute me, and were able to avoid the lies that were exposed in the first trial. However, in doing so, the prosecution used dishonest tactics which resulted in a mistrial.

Given a third chance, the prosecution was able to learn from their mistakes from the first two trials, tailor their case around my consistent story, and use juror instructions that were less than clear to persuade the jury that I was guilty. I cannot express my frustration enough that by remaining consistent and truthful, the prosecution was able to change their story into a narrative that convinced the jury of my guilt.

I do not fault the prosecuting attorney for wanting to fight for his client. As a person with emotions, it would be easy for him to be persuaded by a story regardless of the facts. However, I do question his ethics because he changed his strategy and even called a new witness to the third trial based upon his clients inconsistent (by which I mean saying two directly conflicting things under oath during the first trial) testimony. As a responsible prosecutor and representative of the State, he should have seen the holes in his client's story (or at the very least not enabled them) and dropped the charges long before the conclusion of the third trial.

Meanwhile, my state appointed attorney was just going through the motions. A witness who testified on my behalf during my first trial did not return for the third, and my attorney ignored my concerns of wanting this witness's story told. Under the Constitution, I am supposed to receive fair representation, and I cannot shake the feeling that my attorney was more interested in moving on from the case than defending my innocence.

Our country is based upon freedom and individual rights. I cannot believe that in our legal system, the State has such an advantage over an individual who is supposed to remain innocent until proven guilty, and in defending their innocence remains consistent and honest. Of course, if given enough opportunities and the ability to change a narrative without repercussions, anyone will eventually be convicted.

Like many, I admittedly do not understand the legal system as well as others, like yourself. This fact only adds to the overwhelming doubt and distrust that I and many others feel toward the legal process. I am hoping that you can sense my frustration and passion for my rights and innocence, and use every legal means at your disposal to ensure that this case results in a fair outcome. Thank you for your consideration, time, and fairness.

Sincerely,

Aaron Trotter

Total Control Panel Login

To: steedj@nwattorney.net

Message Score: 1

From: mamabear555@comcast.net

My Spam Blocking Level: Medium

High (60): Pass Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass

Block this sender Block comeast.net

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC

February 27, 2017 - 2:40 PM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 7-4	7-489333-SAG 48933-3-II.pdf	
Case Name: Aar Court of Appeals Case Number: 489	on Trotter 933-3	
Is this a Personal Restraint Petit	tion? Yes • No	
The document being Filed is:		
Designation of Clerk's Papers Papers Statement of Arrangements Motion: Answer/Reply to Motion: Brief: Statement of Additional Auth Cost Bill Objection to Cost Bill Affidavit Letter Copy of Verbatim Report of Phearing Date(s): Personal Restraint Petition (Phearing Date) Response to Personal Restraint Reply to Response to Personal Petition for Review (PRV) Other: _Statement of Addition Comments: No Comments were entered.	orities Proceedings - No. of Volumes: PRP) Int Petition al Restraint Petition	

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

Appeals@co.cowlitz.wa.us Tom.ladouceur@co.cowlitz.wa.us steedj@nwattorney.net